UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/755,351	01/05/2001	Gennaro A. Cuomo	RSW920000175US1	3974

7590 09/29/2004

A. Bruce Clay
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER	
PEREZ DAPLE, AARON C	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/755,351	CUOMO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Aaron C Perez-Daple	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 July 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,10-12,18-23,29-33,35 and 37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-5,10-12,18-23,29-33,35 and 37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Action is in response to Amendment filed 7/19/04, which has been fully considered.

2. Amended claims 1-5, 10-12, 18-23, 29-33, 35 and 37 are presented for examination.

3. Claims 6-9, 13-17, 24-28, 34 and 36 are cancelled by Applicant.

4. This Action is FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 1-5, 10-12, 18-23, 29-33, 35 and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abdelnur et al. (US 6,212,640 B1) (hereinafter Abdelnur) in view of Lee et al. (US 6,167,522).

7. The Examiner interprets that the "web application server" of claim 1, the "data processing system" of claims 18 and 29, the "second server" of claim 19 and the "computer readable medium of claim 37 are equivalent. Moreover, the Examiner interprets that the step of "validating" in line 13 of claim 1, the step of determining whether a server is a trusted server in lines 12-14 of claim 19, and the step of determining whether an expected value is present in lines 13-15 of claim 18, lines 7-9 of claim 29 and lines 8-9 of claim 37, are

equivalent. Therefore, claims 1, 18, 19, 29 and 37 are subject to similar limitations and are properly rejected under the same grounds.

8. As for claims 1, 18, 19, 29 and 37, Abdelnur teaches a network data processing system having a computer program product in a computer readable medium, and a method to be implemented on the network data processing system, the network data processing system comprising:

a bus system (Fig. 7; col. 12, lines 28-55, "An embodiment of...and address lines.");

a communications unit connected to the bus system (COMM INT 720, Fig. 7);

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (main memory 715, mass storage 712, Fig. 7);

a network (Fig. 4);

a plurality of clients connected to the network (client 430, Fig. 4; Client 430 is exemplary. It is understood that clients may be plural. See col. 1, lines 26-34, "In computer networks...via the Internet.");

a first security server connected to the network, wherein the first security server receives a request from a client to access a resource, performs an authentication process with the client, adds information to the request in which the information indicates that the request is from a trusted source to form a modified request, and sends the modified request for processing (web server 480, Fig. 4; Fig. 6; col. 11, line 47 - col. 12, line 6, "At step 610...access rights."); and

a second server connected to the network, wherein the second server receives the modified request from the first security server, presents the modified request to *a security*

application, the security application determining whether the first server is a trusted server, and provides access to the resource in response to a determination that the first server is a trusted server (server 460, Fig. 4; col. 11, line 53 - col. 12, line 20, "If application 410...false credentials.").

Abdelnur does not specifically disclose the means used by the security application in determining whether the first server is a trusted server. Therefore, Abdelnur does not specifically disclose presenting a request to a plurality of components in the second server, each component respectively corresponding to one of a plurality of security servers, as recited in claims 1, 18 and 19. Lee teaches presenting a request to a plurality of components in a server, each component respectively corresponding to one of a plurality of security servers in order to improve network security and performance (col. 3, lines 9-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Abdelnur by presenting a request to a plurality of components in the second server, each component respectively corresponding to one of a plurality of security servers, in order to restrict access to network resources, as taught by Lee (col. 2, lines 25-31).

9. As for claim 2, Abdelnur discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the request is a request to access data (col. 11, lines 47-52, "At step 610...application, for example.").

10. As for claim 3, Abdelnur discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the first security server is a reverse proxy server (web server 480 inherently acts as a reverse proxy server in the disclosed embodiment; col. 11, lines 38-42, "Alternatively, if servlet...and server 460.").

11. As for claim 4, Abdelnur discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the information includes a user identification (col. 12, lines 7-19, "In one or more...submitting false credentials.").

12. As for claim 5, Abdelnur discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the information includes an identification of the first security server (col. 12, lines 7-19, "In one or more...submitting false credentials.").

13. As for claim 10, Abdelnur discloses the method of claim 6, wherein the user identification is a user name and password (col. 9, lines 60-64, "Authentication involves...between the two.").

14. As for claim 11, Abdelnur discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the step of validating further comprises determining a value of the information is an expected value located in a data structure (col. 9, lines 60-64, "Authentication involves...between the two.").

15. As for claim 12, Abdelnur does not specifically disclose a plurality of interceptors in the second server (i.e. web application server). Lee teaches a plurality of interceptors in a server for receiving requests (col. 3, lines 9-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Abdelnur by using a plurality of interceptors in order to restrict access to network resources, as taught by Lee (col. 2, lines 25-31).

16. As for claim 20, Abdelnur does not specifically disclose a second security server performing the same functions as the first security server, wherein the second server contains a second component corresponding to the second security server for determining different security restrictions for the second security server. Lee teaches providing a second security server performing the same functions as the first security server, wherein the second server

contains a second component corresponding to the second security server for determining different security restrictions for the second security server (Fig. 1, col. 3, lines 9-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Abdelnur by using a second security server performing the same functions as the first security server, wherein the second server contains a second component corresponding to the second security server for determining different security restrictions for the second security server in order to restrict access to network resources, as taught by Lee (col. 2, lines 25-31).

17. As for claim 21, Abdelnur discloses the network data processing system of claim 19, wherein the network is at least one of a local area network, an intranet, an extranet and an Internet (col. 1, line 63 - col. 2, line 6, "In modem computing environments...may be communicated.").

18. As for claim 22, Abdelnur does not specifically disclose a plurality of interceptors in the second server (i.e. web application server). Lee teaches a plurality of interceptors in a server for receiving requests (col. 3, lines 9-50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Abdelnur by using a plurality of interceptors for determining that the first security server is a trusted server in order to restrict access to network resources, as taught by Lee (col. 2, lines 25-31).

19. As for claim 23, Abdelnur discloses the network data processing system of claim 19, wherein the second server receives the request directly from the client (step 510, Fig. 5).

20. As for claim 30, Abdelnur discloses the data processing system of claim 29, wherein the modified request requests access to a resource, the data processing system further comprising:

second determining means for determining whether a user of the client is authorized to access the resource (inherent to server 460, Fig. 4; col. 11, lines 12-22, "Web server 480...to network 450."; col. 12, lines 7-20, "In one or more...false credentials."); and

accessing means for accessing the resource using the modified request in response to a determination that the user is authorized (col. 11, line 64 - col. 12, line 6, "Once the request...access rights.").

21. As for claim 31, Abdelnur discloses the data processing system of claim 29, wherein the first security server is a reverse proxy server (web server 480 inherently acts as a reverse proxy server in the disclosed embodiment; col. 11, lines 38-42, "Alternatively, if servlet...and server 460.").

22. As for claim 32, Abdelnur discloses the data processing system of claim 29, wherein the information is an identification of the first security server (col. 9, lines 60-64, "Authentication involves...between the two.").

23. As for claim 33, Abdelnur discloses the data processing system of claim 29, wherein the information is a user name and password of a user of the client (col. 9, lines 60-64, "Authentication involves...between the two.").

24. As for claim 35, Abdelnur discloses the data processing system of claim 29, wherein the plurality of determining means includes a set of interceptors that can provide different security restrictions to a resource (interceptors are inherent for intercepting the request for authentication; col. 11, lines 12-22, "Web server 480...to network 450."; col. 12, lines 7-19, "In one or more embodiments...submitting false credentials.").

Response to Arguments

Claim Objections

25. Objections to claims 18, 19, 29 and 37 are hereby withdrawn in view of Amendment.

112 Claim Rejections

26. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, of claims 5, 6-12, 18, and 29-35 are hereby withdrawn in view of Amendment.

102 Claim Rejections

27. Applicant's arguments with respect to Abdelnur (US 6,212,640 B1) have been considered but are moot in view of new grounds of rejection. Specifically, Applicant asserts on pg. 15 of Remarks filed 7/19/04 that Abdelnur fails to teach an application server having "a plurality of component" corresponding to "a plurality of security servers." Abdelnur is not relied upon to teach this limitation of the claims, as detailed in the rejections under 35 USC 103 (a) above.

103 Claim Rejections

28. Applicant's arguments found on pgs. 16-17 of the Remarks filed 7/19/04 are moot in view of a new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

29. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

US 6,782,294 B2, note Fig. 1 and col. 6, lines 4-13;

US 6,006,258, note source-based routing to selected network resources;

US 6,363,478 B1, note abstract;

US 6,701,438 B1, note authentication servlet;

US 6,088,796, note Fig. 1, col. 13;

US 6,363,479 B1, note abstract.

30. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aaron C Perez-Daple whose telephone number is (703) 305-4897. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9/24/04

Aaron Perez-Daple

N. Elhady